UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/567,689 | 02/09/2006 | Hiroyuki Kikkoji | 278537US6PCT | 2371 |

22850          7590          11/13/2008
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| VU, PHY ANH TRAN |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 4148 | |

| NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 11/13/2008 | ELECTRONIC |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 February 2006</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.    2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) <u>4</u> is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>09 February 2006</u> is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All  b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/24/2008</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

1.      The instant application having Application No. 10/567,689 filed on 2/09/2006 is

presented for examination by the examiner.

### *Oath/Declaration*

2.      The applicant's oath/declaration has been reviewed by the examiner and is found to

conform to the requirements prescribed in **37 C.F.R. 1.63.**

### *Information Disclosure Statement*

3.      The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 5/8/2006 has been

acknowledged.  The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97.  The

information disclosure statement is not being considered by the examiner due to the fact that the

three documents cited were not accompanied with English translations.

### *Specification*

4.      The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the

presence of all possible minor errors.  Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any

errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

        Below are some of the errors found in figure 4, pages 14-19 of the specification by the

examiner and are objected to:

        referenced "CPU" as element 11, when it should be element 101.

referenced "bus" as element 12, when it should be element 102.

referenced "ROM" as element 13, when it should be element 103.

referenced "CPU" as element 11, when it should be element 101.

referenced "RAM" as element 20, when it should be element 104.

referenced "input unit" as element 15, when it should be element 107.

referenced "input-processing unit" as element 14, when it should be element 106.

referenced "display-processing unit" as element 16, when it should be element 108.

referenced "display device" as element 17, when it should be element 17a.

referenced "media drives" as elements 19a and 19b, when they should be elements 109a
& 109b.

referenced "audio-information-processing unit" as element 24, when it should be element
"audio data-processing unit" 121.

referenced "HDD" as element 21, when it should be element105.

referenced "tuner unit" as element 27, when it should be element 11b.

referenced "communications process unit" as element 22, when it should be element 161.

referenced "network interface" as element 23, when it should be element 102

referenced "infrared-array communications unit" as element 28, when it should be
element 181.

### *Claim Objections*

5.      Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 4 recites "cession

ID", the correct spelling should be "session ID".

## *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6.     **Claim 1** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites "deleting means for deleting the apparatus ID data after deleting the service ID data, when the receiving means receives data requesting for deletion of the apparatus ID data, together with the user ID data and apparatus ID data".

For the purpose of examination, examiner will assume "deleting means for deleting the apparatus ID data after deleting the service ID data, when the receiving means receives data requesting for deletion of the apparatus ID data, together with the user ID data and **service ID data**"

### Examiner Notes

7.     Examiner cites particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that, in preparing responses, the applicant fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner

## *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101*

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

8.　　**Claim 4** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter for the following reason:

The claim fails to place the invention squarely within one statutory class of invention. On Page 93, lines 6, 8 of the instant specification, applicant has provided evidence that applicant intends to include signals. As such, the claim is drawn to a form of energy. Energy is not one of the four categories of invention and therefore this claim(s) is/are not statutory. Energy is not a series of steps or acts and thus is not a process. Energy is not a physical article or object and as such is not a machine or manufacture. Energy is not a combination of substances and therefore not a composition of matter.

**Claim 6** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as directed o non-statutory subject matter of software, *per se*. The claim lacks the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or manufacture within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 101. It is clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor is it a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, they fail to fall within a statutory category. It is at best, function descriptive material *per se*.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." Both types of "descriptive material" are non-statutory

when claimed as descriptive material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When

functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes

structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since

use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re*

*Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994).


In this case, applicant has claimed a communication "program" for use in an information-

processing apparatus; this clearly shows that applicant is claiming software, per se, lacking the

hardware necessary to realize any of the underlying functionality. Therefore, claim 6 is directed

to non-statutory subject matter as computer programs, per se, i.e. the descriptions or expressions

of the programs, are not physical "things." They are neither computer components nor statutory

processes, as they are not "acts" being performed. Such claimed "software" do not define any

structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed

elements of a computer, which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized.


### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

9.    The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or
> described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject
> matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole
> would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary
> skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived
> by the manner in which the invention was made.

10.     **Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 are** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuriya

et al (US 2001/0056404 A1, hereinafter Kuriya), and further in view of Natsuno et al (US

2002/0194474 A1, hereinafter Natsuno).


   **Regarding claim 1**, Kuriya discloses an information-processing apparatus configured to

delete information stored in accordance with a request made by a user for canceling service *(Fig.*

*17, elements S4106, S4206; Fig. 33, elements S11206, 11502, wherein content, mobile telephone*

*ID, and ID of portable medium are deleted)*, comprising:

   receiving means for receiving service ID data designating specific service to be provided

together with user ID data *(Paragraphs [0034][0237], reception control means ; wherein user*

*ID and purchasing content which corresponds to service ID are received)*, from an external

apparatus *(Paragraph [0036], wherein, mobile telephone, personal computer, or a PDA*

*corresponds to external apparatus)*;

   storage means for storing the user ID data and service ID data *(Paragraphs  [0034]*

*[0044] [0069] [0420], storage control means)*, in association with apparatus ID data which

identifies the external apparatus  and which has been registered *(Paragraphs [0237] [0259],*

*device ID denotes the ID of mobile phone, personal computer or PDA, which corresponds to*

*apparatus ID)  , wherein when user sends a request to purchase a content to the manager server,*

*the request includes user ID, device ID, and content ID, which implies the device  has been*

*registered)*;

deleting means for deleting the apparatus ID data (*Fig. 17, elements S4106 & S4206;*

*Paragraphs [0267][0320][0324]*), when the receiving means receives data requesting for

deletion of the apparatus ID data, together with the user ID data and service ID data (*Paragraphs*

*[0319-0320, 0324]*) .

   **Kuriya does not disclose** deleting apparatus ID data after deleting service ID data, and

deletion-complete information indicating that the deleting means has finished deleting.

   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the service ID data

deleted before the apparatus ID data.  This is because it would be logical to have an order or

sequence in deleting parameters associated with the canceled service. For instance, if the records

show two apparatuses having different apparatus ID data having the same service with the same

service ID, when a request to cancel service is received from one of the apparatuses,  and if the

apparatus ID data of the apparatus that makes the request has been deleted before the associated

service ID is deleted, then after deleting the apparatus ID, the provider would not be able to

successfully identify the service ID that needs to be deleted next because the association between

the apparatus ID and the service ID has been lost since the apparatus ID is no longer on record to

identify the record of the canceled service.

   **Furthermore, Natsuno discloses** deletion-complete information indicating that the

deleting means has finished deleting (*Paragraphs [0115] [0130] [0139-0140], wherein a*

*deletion completion notice is shown on the display of the mobile terminal*).

   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the teachings of Kuriya into the system of Natsuno because it would provide

for the purpose of saving memory area by getting rid of unnecessary information (*Paragraph*

*[0123]. It is also an indication that the deleting transaction is officially over, so that the*

*resource can be recycled for other processes and updating purposes.)*

transmitting means for transmitting, to the external apparatus (*Paragraphs [0034] [0038]*

*transmission control means;, wherein content is transmitted to information processing*

*apparatus, which corresponds to external apparatus*)

**Regarding claim 2**, Kuriya discloses the information-processing apparatus according to

claim 1, wherein the external apparatus identified by the apparatus ID data stored in the storage

means in association with the service ID data (*Paragraphs [0259] [0262] [0267]*), is requested

to provide the service (*Paragraph[0034] [0237]*).

**Regarding claim 5**, Kuriya discloses a communication method for use in an information-

processing apparatus configured to delete information stored, in accordance with a request made

by a user for canceling service (*Fig. 17, elements S4106, S4206; Fig. 33, elements S11206,*

*11502, wherein content, mobile telephone ID, and ID of portable medium are deleted*) ,

comprising:

Receiving, from an external apparatus, service ID data designating specific service to be

provided, together with user ID data and apparatus ID data identifying the external apparatus

(*Paragraphs [0034][0038][0237], reception control means ; wherein user ID and purchasing*

*content which corresponds to service ID are received; mobile telephone, personal computer, or a*

*PDA corresponds to external apparatus)*;

storing the user ID data, the apparatus ID data and the service ID data, in association with

one another data (*Paragraphs [0044][0259] [0420], storage control means; device ID denotes*

*the ID of mobile phone, personal computer or PDA, which corresponds to apparatus ID*);

deleting the apparatus ID data, when data requesting for deletion of the apparatus ID data

is received, together with the user ID data and apparatus ID data (*Fig. 17, elements S4106 &*

*S4206; Paragraphs [0319][0320][0324]* )

**Kuriya does not disclose** deleting apparatus ID data after deleting service ID data,

transmitting means for transmitting, to the external apparatus, deletion-complete information

indicating that the deleting means has finished deleting.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the service ID data

deleted before the apparatus ID data. This is because it would be logical to have an order or

sequence in deleting parameters associated with the canceled service. For instance, if the records

show two apparatuses having different apparatus ID data having the same service with the same

service ID, when a request to cancel service is received from one of the apparatuses, and if the

apparatus ID data of the apparatus that makes the request has been deleted before the associated

service ID is deleted, then after deleting the apparatus ID, the provider would not be able to

successfully identify the service ID that needs to be deleted next because the association between

the apparatus ID and the service ID has been lost since the apparatus ID is no longer on record to

identify the record of the canceled service.

**Furthermore, Natsuno discloses** transmitting means for transmitting, to the external

apparatus, deletion-complete information indicating that the deleting means has finished deleting

*(Paragraphs [0139-0140], wherein a deletion completion notice is shown on the display of the mobile terminal).*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Natsuno into the system of Kuriya because it would provide for the purpose of saving memory area by getting rid of unnecessary information (*Paragraph [0123]. It is also an indication that the deleting transaction is officially over, so that the resource can be recycled for other processes and updating purposes.)*

**Regarding claim 6**, Kuriya discloses a communication program for use in an information-processing apparatus configured to delete information stored, in accordance with a request made by a user for canceling service *(Fig. 17, elements S4106, S4206; Fig. 33, elements S11206, 11502, wherein content, mobile telephone ID, and ID of portable medium are deleted)*, the communication program causing a computer to:

receive, from an external apparatus, service ID data designating specific service to be provided, together with user ID data and apparatus ID data identifying the external apparatus (*Paragraphs [0034][0038][0237], reception control means ; wherein user ID and purchasing content which corresponds to service ID are received; mobile telephone, personal computer, or a PDA corresponds to external apparatus)*;

store the user ID data, the apparatus ID data and the service ID data, in association with one another (*Paragraphs [0044][0259] [0420], storage control means; device ID denotes the ID of mobile phone, personal computer or PDA, which corresponds to apparatus ID)*;

delete the apparatus ID data, when data requesting for deletion of the apparatus ID data is received, together with the user ID data and apparatus ID data(*Fig. 17, elements S4106 & S4206; Paragraphs [0319][0320][0324]* ) .

**Kuriya does not disclose** deleting apparatus ID data after deleting service ID data, and deletion-complete information indicating that the deleting means has finished deleting.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the service ID data deleted before the apparatus ID data.  This is because it would be logical to have an order or sequence in deleting parameters associated with the canceled service. For instance, if the records show two apparatuses having different apparatus ID data having the same service with the same service ID, when a request to cancel service is received from one of the apparatuses,  and if the apparatus ID data of the apparatus that makes the request has been deleted before the associated service ID is deleted, then after deleting the apparatus ID, the provider would not be able to successfully identify the service ID that needs to be deleted next because the association between the apparatus ID and the service ID has been lost since the apparatus ID is no longer on record to identify the record of the canceled service.

**Furthermore, Natsuno discloses** deletion-complete information indicating that the deleting means has finished deleting (*Paragraphs [0139-0140], wherein a deletion completion notice is shown on the display of the mobile terminal*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Kuriya into the system of Natsuno because it would provide for the purpose of saving memory area by getting rid of unnecessary information (*Paragraph*

*[0123]. It is also an indication that the deleting transaction is officially over, so that the
resource can be recycled for other processes and updating purposes.)*

transmitting means for transmitting, to the external apparatus (*Paragraphs [0034][0039]-
[0040]; transmission control means,, wherein content is transmitted to information processing
apparatus, which corresponds to external apparatus*)

11.    **Claim 3 is** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuriya et al (US

2001/0056404 A1, hereinafter Kuriya), in view of Natsuno et al (US 2002/0194474 A1,

hereinafter Natsuno), and further in view of Flanagin et al (US 6,128,661, hereinafter Flanagin).

**Regarding claim 3**, Kuriya discloses an information-processing system configured to

delete information stored, in accordance with a request made by a user for canceling service

*(Fig. 17, elements S4106, S4206; Fig. 33, elements S11206, 11502, wherein content, mobile

telephone ID, and ID of portable medium are deleted)*, comprising:

an information-processing apparatus having receiving means   for receiving service ID

data designating specific service to be provided, together with user ID data identifying the user

*(Paragraphs [0034][0038] [0237]]; reception control means; wherein user ID and purchasing

content which corresponds to service ID are received)* and apparatus ID data identifying the

external apparatus (*Paragraphs [0108][0113][0259], wherein device ID denotes the ID of

mobile phone, personal computer or PDA, which corresponds to external apparatus)* , storage

means (*Paragraph [0034][0044], storage control means)* for storing the user ID data, apparatus

ID data and service ID data, in association with one another *(Paragraphs [0237] [0259] [0420])*,

*(Fig. 17, elements S4106 & S4206; Paragraphs [0319][0320][0324])*, and

transmitting means for transmitting, to the external apparatus *(Paragraphs [0039]-[0040]; transmission control means, wherein content is transmitted to information processing apparatus, which corresponds to external apparatus)*

and an external apparatus having data-transmitting means for transmitting the user ID data, apparatus ID data and service ID data to the information-processing apparatus *(Paragraphs [0034][0043]][0237], wherein the mobile telephone which corresponds to an external apparatus transmits a request for purchasing a content to manager server. The request includes user ID, apparatus ID and service ID)*, ID data storage means for storing the apparatus ID data *(Fig. 14, element S3107; Fig. 17, element S4109, wherein the stored content is associated with user ID, apparatus ID, and service ID)*, deletion-request transmitting means for transmitting the data requesting for deletion *(Fig. 33, element S11106)*, and

**Kuriya does not disclose** deleting apparatus ID data after deleting service ID data, deletion-complete information indicating that the deleting means has finished deleting, and completion-information receiving means for receiving the deletion-complete information.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the service ID data deleted before the apparatus ID data. This is because it would be logical to have an order or sequence in deleting parameters associated with the canceled service. For instance, if the records show two apparatuses having different apparatus ID data having the same service with the same service ID, when a request to cancel service is received from one of the apparatuses, and if the

apparatus ID data of the apparatus that makes the request has been deleted before the associated

service ID is deleted, then after deleting the apparatus ID, the provider would not be able to

successfully identify the service ID that needs to be deleted next because the association between

the apparatus ID and the service ID has been lost since the apparatus ID is no longer on record to

identify the record of the canceled service.

**Natsuno discloses** deletion-complete information indicating that the deleting means has

finished deleting the features requested by user (*Paragraphs [0139-0140], wherein a deletion*

*completion notice is shown on the display of the mobile terminal*).

**Further more, Natsuno also discloses** completion-information receiving means for

receiving the deletion-complete information (*Paragraphs [0139-0140], wherein a deletion*

*completion notice is shown on the display of the mobile terminal. It is also an indication that the*

*deleting transaction is officially over, so that the resource can be recycled for other processes*

*and updating purposes*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the teachings of Natsuno into the system of Kuriya because it would provide

for the purpose of saving memory area by getting rid of unnecessary information (*Paragraph*

*[0123]*)

**Kuriya in view of Natsuno** does not disclose an ID data deleting means for deleting the

apparatus ID data stored.

**However, Flanagin discloses** deleting means for deleting the apparatus ID data stored

(*Col. 11, lines 59-67; Col. 12, lines 2-18, wherein the device name which corresponds to the*

*apparatus ID data can be changed by the user, which implies there exists a deleting means for*

*deleting the apparatus ID in order to change its name)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the teachings of Flanagin into the system of Kuriya in view of Natsuno

because it would provide for the purpose of having a unique apparatus ID that does not

correspond to any other partnership on the device that it comes into communication with (*Col.*

*12, lines 7-18*).

12.      **Claim 4 is** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuriya et al (US

2001/0056404 A1, hereinafter Kuriya), and further in view of Natsuno et al (US 2002/0194474

A1, hereinafter Natsuno), in view of Flanagin et al (US 6,128,661, hereinafter Flanagin), and

further in view of Takeuchi (US 2003/0134615 A1).

**Regarding claim 4**, Kuriya in view of Natsuno & Flanagin disclose  the information-

processing system according to claim 3, wherein: the information-processing apparatus has

authenticating means for performing an authenticating process in accordance with at least the

user ID data and apparatus ID data and for issuing an authentication session ID that identifies a

session with the external apparatus (*Paragraphs [0016][0213]*).

**Kuriya in view of Natsuno & Flanagin do not disclose**:

the transmitting means transmits the authentication session ID to the external apparatus

the external apparatus transmits the service ID data, together with the authentication

session ID received from the information-processing apparatus;

the information-processing apparatus verifies the authentication session ID received,

issues an authentication ticket corresponding to the service ID data received;

the transmitting means transmits authentication ticket to the external apparatus;

the data-transmitting means of the external apparatus transmits a service-requesting

signal to a server which provides the service, together with the authentication ticket received, the

service-requesting signal requesting that the server should provide the service.

**However, Takeuchi discloses** the transmitting means transmits the authentication

session ID to the external apparatus (*Paragraphs [0017] [0071], wherein access key which*

*corresponds to session ID is transmitted to external apparatus*).

the external apparatus transmits the service ID data, together with the authentication

session ID received from the information-processing apparatus *(Paragraphs [0017] [0071]*

*[0074] wherein external device transmits service requested (corresponds to service ID data)*

*along with access key received to service provision server)*;

the information-processing apparatus verifies the authentication session ID received,

issues an authentication ticket corresponding to the service ID data received *(Paragraphs [0018]*

*[0075], wherein when receives access key from external apparatus, service provision server*

*verifies that key matches with key from issuance server, if they match, service provision server*

*issues an information for providing service (which corresponds to authentication ticket)* to

external apparatus;

the transmitting means transmits authentication ticket to the external apparatus

*(Paragraphs [0018] [0071], wherein service provision server transmits information for*

*providing the service to external apparatus)*;

the data-transmitting means of the external apparatus transmits a service-requesting

signal to a server which provides the service, together with the authentication ticket received, the

service-requesting signal requesting that the server should provide the service *(Paragraphs*

*[0017][0071][0074][0083], wherein the service user receives service after the service provider*

*performed verification)*.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the teaching of Takeuchi into the system of Kuriya in view of Natsuno, and

Flanagin because it would provide for the purpose of providing a simplified steps of

authentication to users, to prevent unauthorized access by performing reliable authentication.


## Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to PHY ANH VU whose telephone number is (571)270-7317. The

examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thr 7:30-5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Thomas Pham can be reached on 571-272-3689. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


PVU


/THOMAS  PHAM/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4148